

Laura Vartain Horn (SBN 258485)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2700
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 439-1625
laura.vartain@kirkland.com

Jessica Davidson (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Christopher D. Cox (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
jessica.davidson@kirkland.com
christopher.cox@kirkland.com

Allison M. Brown (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
2005 Market Street, Suite 1000
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 268-5000
alli.brown@kirkland.com

Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC,
and RASIER-CA, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB (LJC)

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO SEAL PERSONAL
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND
INFORMATION DESIGNATED AS
CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO ECF 176
CONTAINED IN DEFENDANTS'
MOTION REGARDING FRAUDULENT
PLAINTIFF FACT SHEETS**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF SEALING CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

Under Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC ("Uber" or "Defendants") hereby move this Court for an order to seal the personal identifying information ("PII") contained in their Motion Regarding Fraudulent Plaintiff Fact Sheets (the "Motion") and some of its exhibits. The Motion and exhibits contain PII and information designated as confidential pursuant to the Protective Order entered in this matter from materials produced by Plaintiffs. *See* ECF 176. The Motion and exhibits are attached as Exhibit A, filed with this Administrative Motion.

A party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of establishing that "compelling reasons" support that request. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006). Specifically, that party must "articulate[] compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings . . . that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure [of court records], such as the 'public interest in understanding the judicial process.'" *Id.* (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). "In turn, the [C]ourt must 'conscientiously balance[] the competing interests' of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret." *Id.* at 1179 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135).

Assessment of the public and private interests implicated here warrant sealing this information. Local Rule 79-5(c)(1)(i). Uber in particular seeks to seal PII and excerpts of responses provided within certain Plaintiff Fact Sheets ("PFS") produced by counsel via MDL Centrality ("MDLC") which are considered confidential and subject to the Protective Order entered in this matter. *See* ECF 176. Courts have found that such information "is sealable under the compelling reasons standard." *See, e.g., Kumandan v. Google LLC*, No. 19-cv-04286-BLF, 2022 WL 17971633, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2022). That is because such information is "not relevant to any of the issues in this litigation, nor would the public have any real interest in its disclosure." *O'Connor v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. C-13-3826 EMC, 2015 WL 355496, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2015). On the other hand, the public disclosure of the PII and excerpts of responses provided within certain PFS contained within the Motion could cause significant and avoidable harm or embarrassment to the affected individuals. Moreover, no less restrictive alternative to sealing the PII and excerpts of responses provided within certain PFS within the Motion is sufficient.

1 Local Rule 79-5(c)(1)(iii). Uber’s request is narrowly tailored to seal only the PII and excerpts of
2 responses provided within certain PFS while ensuring that the public retains access to the rest of the
3 Motion and related documents. This Court may therefore “appropriately balance[]” the privacy interests
4 of the affected individuals with the public’s right to access by allowing redaction of all such PII and
5 excerpts of responses provided within certain PFS in the Motion, as well as sealing exhibits D-M, which
6 are confidential PFS. *O’Connor*, 2015 WL 355496, at *2.

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 For the foregoing reasons, Uber respectfully requests this Court grant this Administrative Motion
9 to seal excerpts of responses provided within certain PFS contained in the Motion and seal Exhibits D-M
10 to the Motion, which consist of PFS marked confidential under the Protective Order.

11
12 DATED: December 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

13 /s/ Laura Vartain Horn

14 Laura Vartain Horn (SBN 258485)
15 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
16 555 California Street, Suite 2700
17 San Francisco, CA 94104
18 Telephone: (415) 439-1625
19 laura.vartain@kirkland.com